



OCTOBER 8, 2015

# REBUILD BY DESIGN

■ RESIST ■ DELAY ■ STORE ■ DISCHARGE ■

## HUDSON RIVER

Hoboken Weehawken Jersey City

### CAG MEETING SUMMARY

**DATE:** October 8, 2015  
**TIME:** 6:30 PM - 8:00 PM  
**LOCATION:** Jubilee Center of Hoboken  
601 Jackson Street | Hoboken | NJ  
**PURPOSE:** Recap on Project Status, Scoping Process  
and Introduction on Concept Screening

Table 1: List of Attendees

Name of Attendee	✓	Organization
Melissa Abernathy	✓	QLC
Don Conger	✓	North Hudson Sewerage Authority
Carter Craft	✓	CAG: Hoboken
Jennifer Gonzalez	✓	CAG: Green Team
Naomi Hsu	✓	CAG: Jersey City Senior Transportation Planner
Phil Jonet	✓	Hoboken Resident
Rev. Marvin Krieger	✓	CAG: Community Church of Hoboken
Ivan Schlachter	✓	CAG: Weehawken
Caleb Stratton	✓	City of Hoboken
Kostas Svarnas	✓	Newport

Name of Attendee	✓	Organization
Noelle Thurlow	✓	CAG: Resilience Adventures
Rich Tremitedi	✓	CAG: Shipyard
Francoise Vielot	✓	CAG: Hoboken Family Alliance
Ken Spahn	✓	Dewberry
Rahul Parab	✓	Dewberry
Larry Smith	✓	Dewberry
Gary Doss	✓	Dewberry
Sara Dougherty	✓	Dewberry
Steve Hodapp	✓	Dewberry
Anna Vanderhoof	✓	Dewberry
Brian Sayre	✓	Dewberry
Max Reis	✓	Dewberry
Steve Eget	✓	Dewberry
Dennis Reinknecht	✓	NJDEP
Frank Schwarz	✓	NJDEP
Clay Sherman	✓	NJDEP
Ryan Walsh	✓	Fitzgerald & Halliday
Daniel Pittman	✓	OMA
Laura Baird	✓	OMA
Helen Billson	✓	OMA
Timothy Ho	✓	OMA
Alex Yuan	✓	OMA
Alyson Beha	✓	HUD

# SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

## 1. Welcome and Introductions:

Ryan Walsh with the Dewberry Team welcomed the CAG members and thanked them for taking time to attend the third CAG meeting. Ryan introduced the presentation and outlined the meeting's agenda.

## 2. Housekeeping:

Dennis Reinknecht of NJDEP noted that scheduling commitments were made in the previous CAG meeting regarding providing CAG members with responses and information in a timely fashion. Dennis noted that all commitments regarding the previous meeting were met and stated that for the current meeting, a summary of the meeting would be provided to the CAG and that the team asks that CAG members provide feedback on the summary within five days of receipt. It was also noted that improvements are currently being made to the project website.

## 3. Presentation:

Ken Spahn of Dewberry provided an overview of the current project status, including a recap of the scoping meeting, update on the status of the Scoping Document, and a reiteration that the comment period closes on October 9. Ken thanked CAG members who attended the Scoping Meeting and Ken also provided a recap on the two drop-in sessions that were held the week following the Scoping Meeting.

- Dennis asked CAG members how they felt about the drop-in sessions. CAG members indicated that not enough time was provided prior to the drop-ins to allow members of the public time to attend. It was requested that at least two weeks advance notice be provided prior to scheduling public sessions. Another member of the CAG stated that the times (late evening) were not ideal for some people.

Ken Spahn noted that so far about 75 comments have been received on the Scoping Document. Comments on the Scoping Document have been received in many forms, from written (such as those left in comment boxes at the Scoping Meeting or via email to the project email address), to verbal interactions at the various meetings. Ken informed the CAG that comments on the Scoping Document range widely, from specific flooding concerns, to very general comments regarding the proposed project concepts. Substantive comments will be incorporated into the Scoping Document and a final version will be issued at the end of the month.

- A CAG member asked how the Scoping Document impacts the project. Ken and Larry Smith of Dewberry informed the CAG member that the Scoping Document acts as a framework/roadmap for the project process. Another CAG member asked if it was too late to provide "big picture" comments on the project concepts. Larry responded that no, comments on the project concepts would continue to be accepted.
- A CAG member suggested that it is important to allow people to provide comments, and not just questions, at public meetings. This is in response to the Scoping Meeting Q&A session format. Due to time constraints, the Q&A session had been limited to questions; if people had comments, they were encouraged to follow up at another time. The CAG member suggested that it was important to allow people to simply make comments or statements in order to make it feel more inclusive for the public.

Rahul Parab of Dewberry provided an overview of the data collection and flood modeling process. Rahul detailed the ongoing data collection efforts, particularly the waterfront inspection and geotechnical groundwater depth investigations. He explained that the waterfront inspections tell us the current status of the existing waterfront structures, including their capability to support a *Resist* strategy. He also explained that the groundwater investigations revealed that the Study Area has very high groundwater, which will impact the ability to construct certain types of *Delay/Store* components. Rahul then showed the CAG two time-lapse animations developed to show a Sandy-type flood event; one animation showed overall heights of flood water, the other showed the depths of the water. Dennis also informed the CAG that Stevens Institute is being engaged to help calibrate and QA/QC the coastal model.

- A CAG member asked how far inland the “waterfront” extended. Rahul explained that the area considered the “waterfront” extends from the bulkhead to the walkway.
- A CAG member asked how seasonal variation in groundwater elevation is being taken into account. Rahul explained that monthly monitoring is being undertaken to show seasonal variation.
- A CAG member asked whether rainfall events affect the depth to groundwater. Rahul explained that the change in groundwater depends on the tide or storm surge. For bioswales to work, depth to groundwater needs to be between 10-20 feet.
- A CAG member asked for timestamps to be provided on the animation and noted that the animations appeared to show correctly how water entered the community at the Hoboken Terminal and around Weehawken Cove. The CAG member further stated that the model appeared to show how once the water receded from the shoreline, substantial ponding remained in the inland areas.
- CAG members asked to have screenshots of the model, showing various stages of flooding, available on the website.
- A CAG member noted that the Department of Maritime Science students had 30 data points showing extent of flooding, and commented that this data was being used by Rahul to help calibrate the model.
- A CAG member asked whether individual property owners are being asked about remediation efforts. Larry explained that for the Hazardous Waste Screening, a set of environmental remediation databases were being reviewed for current status of various site remediation efforts within the Study Area.

Ken Spahn completed the presentation by providing an overview of the Concept Screening process. Ken explained how criteria (areas of impact) and metrics (how we measure the criteria) are incorporated into a matrix in order to evaluate each project concept. The criteria and metrics reflect the data gathered to date; in the Concept Screening phase, the metrics will be more “qualitative” (with values such as “high,” “medium,” or “low”). In the Alternatives Analysis phase, we will have more quantitative data (numbers or values) to make more detailed comparisons. Ken provided an overview of the current criteria categories being developed by the Dewberry team and asked for input from the community. Ken also stated that a more in-depth criteria and metrics development workshop would be set up for the CAG in the future.

- A CAG member asked when input would be sought on the criteria and metrics. Larry and Dennis explained that a workshop would be set up later in the month and that information would be sent out in advance so that CAG members have enough of a chance to review the materials.
- A CAG member noted that the criteria match up with areas of study in the Scoping Document. He encouraged members to read the document to familiarize themselves with other possible criteria.

#### 4. Q&A and Wrap-Up:

Ryan Walsh thanked members for attending and opened up the forum for any other general questions or comments. Several members of the CAG stayed behind to provide more comments on the Study Area map (see attached).

- Caleb Stratton with the City of Hoboken stated that he would follow up with CAG members to determine the best date for the criteria/metrics workshop meeting. CAG members suggested that it would be best to meet in two weeks (last week of October).

Table 2: List of Action Items

Action Item	Assigned To	Due Date	Status
Provide comment on meeting summary	CAG	10.21.15	In process
CAG workshop on Screening Criteria	Hoboken/NJDEP	TBD	In process